

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1, 2, 5-12, and 15-20 are pending in this application. By this amendment, Applicant amends Claims 1, 2, 5, 7-12, and 15-20, and cancels Claims 3, 4, 13, and 14.

Non-elected Claims 6, 8-10, 16, and 18-20 are dependent upon generic Claims 1 and 11. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner rejoin and allow Claims 6, 8-10, 16, and 18-20 when generic Claims 1 and 11 are allowed.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's indication that Claims 7 and 17 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the features of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 1, 2, 11, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tanaka (JP 05-103391). Claims 5 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tanaka in view of North (U.S. 6,801,631).

Claim 1 has been amended to recite:

A speaker system comprising:  
a main speaker;  
a plurality of subordinate speakers;  
**a first signal line connected in series to the plurality of subordinate speakers; and**  
**a second signal line connected to the main speaker;** wherein  
a pseudo-spherical wave having the main speaker at a center thereof is generated such that the main speaker and the plurality of subordinate speakers are vibrated in a frequency range of piston vibration and are in phase with each other and a propagation speed of a sound wave produced by vibration of the plurality of subordinate speakers is less than a propagation speed of a sound wave produced by vibration of the main speaker; and  
**the first signal line and the second signal line are connected in parallel.** (emphasis added)

Applicant's Claim 11 recites features that are similar to the features recited in Applicant's Claim 1, including the above-emphasized features.

The Examiner alleged that Tanaka teaches all of the features recited in Applicant's Claims 1 and 11.

Applicant's Claim 1 has been amended to recite the features of "a first signal line

connected in series to the plurality of subordinate speakers,” “a second signal line connected to the main speaker,” and “the first signal line and the second signal line are connected in parallel.” Applicant’s Claim 11 has been similarly amended. Support for these features is found, for example, in originally filed Claims 7 and 17.

In contrast to Applicant’s Claims 1 and 11, as shown in Fig. 1 of Tanaka, each of the speakers 1 of Tanaka is connected in parallel to another of the speakers 1, and none of the speakers 1 of Tanaka are connected in series. Thus, Tanaka certainly fails to teach or suggest the features of “a first signal line connected in series to the plurality of subordinate speakers,” “a second signal line connected to the main speaker,” and “the first signal line and the second signal line are connected in parallel” as recited in Applicant’s Claim 1, and similarly in Applicant’s Claim 11.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of Claims 1 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Tanaka.

The Examiner relied upon North to allegedly cure deficiencies of Tanaka. However, North clearly fails to teach or suggest the features of “a first signal line connected in series to the plurality of subordinate speakers,” “a second signal line connected to the main speaker,” and “the first signal line and the second signal line are connected in parallel” as recited in Applicant’s Claim 1, and similarly in Applicant’s Claim 11. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that North fails to cure the deficiencies of Tanaka described above.

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that it would not have been obvious to modify the speaker system of Tanaka to include the features of “a first signal line connected in series to the plurality of subordinate speakers,” “a second signal line connected to the main speaker,” and “the first signal line and the second signal line are connected in parallel” as recited in Applicant’s Claim 1, and similarly in Applicant’s Claim 11. Particularly, in the present invention, the subordinate speakers are connected in series to enable the propagation speed of a sound wave produced by

vibration of the plurality of subordinate speakers to be less than a propagation speed of a sound wave produced by vibration of the main speaker.

In contrast, Tanaka provides input level (gain) setters 3 for the signal lines for each of the pairs of speakers 1 to enable the input level, i.e., propagation speed, of the pairs of speakers to be independently controlled so as provide an improved directivity-controlled loudspeaker system. Thus, there would have been absolutely no reason to connect any of the speakers of Tanaka in series with one another because the input level/propagation speed of the pairs of speakers 1 of Tanaka is already controlled. In fact, it appears that if any of the speakers 1 of Tanaka were connected in series, then the overall loudspeaker system would be unsatisfactory for its intended purpose. Particularly, if the speakers 1 of Tanaka were connected in series with one another, then there would be no independent control of the speakers.

The Examiner is reminded that if the proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification. In re Gordon, 733 F.2d 900, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984) and MPEP § 2143.01.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1 and 11 are allowable. Claims 2, 5, 7, 9, 12, 15, and 17 depend upon Claims 1 and 11, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons that Claims 1 and 11 are allowable. In addition, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner rejoin and allow non-elected Claims 6, 8-10, 16, and 18-20, which are dependent upon generic Claims 1 and 11.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are solicited.

Application S.N. 10/733,040  
June 13, 2008  
Page 11 of 11

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1353.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 13, 2008

/Christopher A. Bennett #46,710/  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

**KEATING & BENNETT, LLP**  
8180 Greensboro Drive, Suite 850  
Tyson's Corner, VA 22102  
Telephone: (703) 637-1480  
Facsimile: (703) 637-1499

Joseph R. Keating  
Registration No. 37,368  
Christopher A. Bennett  
Registration No. 46,710